



dcorbett@telecomlawpros.com  
202.789.3115

August 18, 2017

**VIA ELECTRONIC COMMENT FILING SYSTEM**

Marlene H. Dortch  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW  
Washington, D.C. 20054

Re: *In the Matter of Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2017*  
MD Docket No. 17-134

**Notice of Ex Parte Communication**

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On August 15, 2017, undersigned counsel to Ramar Communications, Inc. (“Ramar”) met with David Grossman, Chief of Staff and Media Policy Advisor to Commissioner Mignon Clyburn. In the meeting, I addressed issues raised by Ramar in its June 22, 2017 Comments in MD Docket No. 17-134 relating to the “satellite” status of certain Ramar television stations in the Albuquerque-Santa Fe DMA (“ASFD”) for purposes of annual regulatory fees.

Ramar asked that the Commission afford it equitable regulatory fee treatment vis-à-vis all other satellite television stations – i.e., those which need waivers pursuant to Note 5 of 47 C.F.R. § 73.3555 due to predicted signal contour overlap between parent and satellite, and those with no such overlap and no need for Note 5 waivers. Ramar pointed out that all satellite stations are “second class citizens” in the competitive marketplace, and that the Commission has historically assessed lower regulatory fees on all stations listed as satellites in standard industry publications, whether or not the station needed a Note 5 waiver. With respect to the ASFD, where Note 5 waivers are typically not needed by satellites because of that DMA’s vast geographic area, Ramar supplied illustrative maps, copies of which are attached hereto, showing the starkly inferior nature of the ASFD over-the-air coverage of satellite stations versus those stations’ parents. For example, KUPT covers only 3.26 percent of the ASFD’s population and 2.15 percent of its area.

Ramar suggested that the Commission ensure equitable regulatory fee treatment of all satellite stations by clarifying that the Commission will be guided by satellite status as shown in standard industry sources like BIA Kelsey or the Television and Cable Factbook (an approach which has the benefit of being market-based – advertising and programming markets disfavor stations that hold themselves out

{00113323;v1}



August 18, 2017  
Page 2

as satellites). In the alternative, Ramar urged the Commission to make clear that non-Note 5 waiver stations will be given the opportunity to make showings to the Commission that they are satellites, not “standalone” stations.

Sincerely,

/s/ Dennis P. Corbett

Dennis P. Corbett  
of TELECOMMUNICATIONS LAW PROFESSIONALS PLLC

cc (via email): David Grossman